REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

Claims 1-3 and 8 are allowed.

Claims 4-7, 9, and 10 were objected to because of informalities.

Claims 11-12,14, 18-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Kreuder et al., USPN 5,763,636.

In the Office Action at page 4, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Igarashi et al. (USPN 6,301,231; hereafter referenced as Igarashi et al.).

Claims 11-14 and 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreuder et al., USPN 5,763,636.

These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In accordance with the foregoing, the specification has been amended, claims 4-7, 9, 10, 11, 15 , 18 and 22 have been amended, and claims 12 and 19 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the foregoing amendments and new claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-11, 13-18 and 20-24 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

On page 8, paragraph 39 and at the bottom of page 13, formula 5 inadvertently showed 5 bonds for carbon. The typographical errors in Formula 5 has been amended on pages 8 and 13 (in reaction 2). Since it is clear that Formula 5 (see reaction product in reaction 2 wherein the reaction product (Formula 5) is substantially correct, except that the formula-writing program inadvertently inserted too many carbon bonds) was intended to be as is now shown, no new matter is presented. Thus, the specification is deemed to be in form to be allowed.

OBJECTIONS FOR INFORMALITIES:

In the Office Action at page 2, the Examiner objected to claims 4, 7, 9 and 10 due to informalities.

Periods have been added at the ends of claims 4, 7, 9 and 10.

There was an error in formula 5 in claims 7 and 10, inadvertently showing 5 bonds for carbon. Claims 7 and 10 have been amended to show the correct formula 5.

The misspellings in claims 5 and 6 have been corrected.

Thus, claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 9 and 10 have been corrected and are now in a form to be allowed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action at pages 3-4, the Examiner rejected claims 11-12, 14, 18-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Kreuder et al. (USPN 5,763,636; hereafter referenced as Kreuder et al.).

In the Office Action at page 4, the Examiner rejected claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Igarashi et al. (USPN 6,301,231; hereafter referenced as Igarashi et al.).

These rejections are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

A) With respect to the Examiner's rejection of claims 11-12, 14, 18-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Kreuder et al.

Claim 11 and claim 18 have been amended to include the features of claims 12 and 19, respectively, which include the limitation that the spirofluorene groups are perpendicular to each other, which is not taught by Kreuder et al. Thus, amended claims 11 and 12 are now believed to be in allowable form. Since claims 14 and 21 depend from amended claims 11 and 12, respectively, claims 14 and 21 are also deemed to be in allowable form.

Thus, claims 11-12, 14, 18-19 and 21 are deemed to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §102 in view of Kreuder et al. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

B) With respect to the Examiner's rejection of claims 15-17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) in view of Igarashi et al.:

Claim 15 has been amended to read: "An organic electroluminescence compound comprising: an aryl group; and triarylsilphenyl groups, wherein the aryl group and each of the aryl groups of the triarylsiophenyl groups have two or less aromatic hydrocarbon rings in a condensed state."

It is respectfully submitted that Igarashi et al. appears to teach a luminescent device material, with the material comprising a compound represented by a formula having Si sharing electrons with R^1, Ar^{11}, Ar^{12}, and Ar^{13}, wherein R^1 represents an alkyl group, an aryl group, a heteroaryl group or an alkynyl group and each of Ar^{11}, Ar^{12}, and Ar^{13} represents a heteroaryl group (see col. 2, lines 18-28).

Similarly, Igarashi et al. appears to teach a luminescent device material, with the material comprising a compound represented by a formula having Si sharing electrons with R^2, Ar^{21}-R^{21}, Ar^{22}-R^{22}, and Ar^{23}-R^{23}, wherein R^2 represents an alkyl group, each of Ar^{21}, Ar^{22}, and Ar^{23} represents

an arylene group and each of R^{21}, R^{22}, and R^{23} represent an aryl group or a heteroaryl group (see col. 2, lines 32-46), and further, wherein the compound is represented by a formula having Si sharing electrons with R^3, Ar^{31}- R^{31}, Ar^{32}- R^{32}, and Ar^{33}- R^{33}, wherein R^3 represents an alkyl group, an aryl group, a heteroaryl group or an alkynyl group, each of the Ar^{31}, Ar^{32}, and Ar^{33} represents an arylene group, and each of R^{31}, R^{32}, and R^{33} represent an alkenyl group or an alkynyl group (see col. 2, lines 50-64; col. 3, lines 1-17).

Also, Igarashi et al. appears to teach a compound represented by a formula having Si sharing electrons with R^4, Ar^{41}-R^{41}, Ar^{42}-R^{42}, and Ar^{43}-R^{43}, wherein each of the Ar^{41}-R^{41}, Ar^{42}-R^{42}, and Ar^{43}-R^{43} represents an arylene group, and each of R^{41}, R^{42}, and R^{43} represents $NR^{44}R^{45}$, $-OR^{46}$, $-OR^{46}$ or $-S-R^{47}$, each of R^{44}, R^{45}, R^{46} and R^{47} represents a hydrogen atom or a substituent group.

"Heteroaryl groups" are derived from heteroarenes by removal of a hydrogen atom from any ring atom of the heteroarene, an unsaturated 5 or 6 membered cyclic ring in which one or more of the atoms in the ring is an element other than carbon and the remaining atoms of the ring are carbon (IUPAC Compendium of Chemical Technology, 2nd Edition, 1997). "Arylene groups" are bivalent groups derived from arenes by removal of a hydrogen atom from two ring cargon atoms, i.e., are arenediyl groups (IUPAC Compendium of Chemical Technology, 2nd Edition, 1997). Thus, the above examples taught by Igarashi et al. fail to teach triarylsilphenyl groups and an aryl group as are taught by amended claim 15 of the present invention.

In addition, Igarashi et al. appears to teach a luminescent device material, with the material comprising a compound represented by a formula having Si sharing electrons with R^5, Ar^{51}, Ar^{52}, and Ar^{53}, wherein R^5 represents an alkyl group, an aryl group, a heteroaryl group or an alkynyl group and each of Ar^{51}, Ar^{52}, and Ar^{53} represents a group containing at least three aromatic hydrocarbon rings in a condensed state. An "aryl group" is a group derived from an arene by removal of a hydrogen atom from a ring carbon atom (IUPAC Compendium of Chemical Technology, 2nd Edition, 1997). However, Igarashi et al. fails to teach Si sharing electrons with an aryl group and triarylsilphenyl groups wherein the aryl group and each of aryl groups of the triarylsiophenyl groups and the aryl group have two or less aromatic hydrocarbon rings in a condensed state, as is taught by amended claim 15 of the present invention.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

In the Office Action at page 4, the Examiner rejected claims 11-14 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) in view of Kreuder et al., USPN 5,763,636.

The rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 11 and claim 18 have been amended to include claims 12 and 19, respectively, which

iinclude the limitation that the spirofluorene groups are perpendicular to each other, which is not taught or suggested by Kreuder et al. Thus, amended claims 11 and 12 are now believed to be in allowable form.

Since claims 13-14 and 20-21 depend from amended claims 11 and 18, respectively, claims 13-14 and 20-21 are deemed to be allowable for at least the reasons that amended claims 11 and 18 are allowable.

Thus, claims 11, 13-14 , 18 and 20-21 are deemed to be patentable over Kreuder et al. under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot., and further, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any additional fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

July 17, 2003

By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

700 Eleventh Street, N.W.
Suite 500
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501